

Remarks/Arguments

In the non-final Office Action dated February 13, 2008, it is noted that: claims 1-12 are pending; claims 1-12 stand rejected; and claims 1 and 12 are independent.

Specification

The Abstract is objected to. Applicants have submitted a substitute Abstract to replace the original Abstract in its entirety. In view of the substitute Abstract it is respectfully requested the objection be withdrawn.

The title is objected to as not being descriptive. Applicants have replaced the title with substantially the same title proposed by the Examiner in the Office Action. In view of the new title it is respectfully requested the objection be withdrawn.

Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out the suggested guidelines for the specification arrangement. As these are only guidelines applicants decline at this time to amend the specification.

Drawings

Figure 1 is objected to as requiring the legend of "Prior Art." Applicants respectfully disagree that Figure 1 should be labeled as prior art. The drawing was created by the inventors and is useful in explaining aspects of the claimed invention. For example, the drawing is used in describing a typical degradation behavior of a LED device driven at a constant current. As such the drawing should not be considered prior art and it is respectfully requested the objection be withdrawn.

Claims

Claims 1-12 have been amended herein to remove reference designators and to clarify the claimed subject matter. The clarifying amendments to claims 1 and 12 are based on the original disclosure, for example, pages 6, lines 2-25. No new matter is entered.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Tokunaga et al., EP 1079361 (hereinafter "Tokunaga"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 includes the features of: “sensors for monitoring operating conditions of the display pixels including monitoring total charge data of the pixels.”

Independent claim 12 includes the features of: “obtaining data from the sensors related to the operating conditions including total charge data.”

On page 7 of the Office Action, in discussing claims 2 and 5, it is admitted that Tokunagu fails to teach or suggest the claimed features relating to the total charge data. Because the reference does not teach or suggest every claimed feature, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 12 as anticipated by Tokunagu is obviated and should be withdrawn.

In addition, the above mentioned claimed features are not found in the combination of Tokunaga in view of Cok et al. (hereinafter “Cok”). On page 7 of the Office Action, it is argued that Cok, col. 4, lines 22-36 discloses monitoring means for current and time. Applicants respectfully disagree since Cok fails to mention or suggest monitoring current and time and further fails to suggest total charge data.

Cok, col. 4, lines 22-36 discloses: “The actual attributes measured will depend on the technology of the display device, the materials that comprise it and the manufacturing process used to create it. In particular, the charge storage at the pixel site, the impedance across any light emitting pixel, the efficiency and frequency of the light emission, current draw, and voltage drop at particular points in a circuit, are all important attributes of the pixel performance.”

Cok never suggests monitoring current and time and further fails to suggest total charge data. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 12 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Tokunaga and Cok and should be allowed.

Rejection of Claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-5 and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tokunaga in view of Cok. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above claims 1 and 12 include features not found in the combination of Tokunaga and Cok. Claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from claim 1 and include at least the above mentioned features of claim 1. Because these dependent claims include the features of claim 1 and further distinguishing features they should likewise be allowed.

These dependent claims include further distinguishing feature, for example claim 3 includes: “the controller is adapted to derive an acceleration factor from the temperature data and to adjust the driving signal depending on the product of the total charge data and the acceleration factor.”

The combination of Tokunaga and Cok fail to teach or suggest the claimed features. Nor does the Office Action provide any indication of where such features are suggested by the combination.

Claim 10 includes: “means to sense a relation between a reverse current and a reverse voltage of the pixels for deriving degradation state data for the pixels, and said controller is adapted to generate said driving signal taking account of said degradation state data.”

The Office Action points to Tokunaga paragraphs 156 and 163 as allegedly showing the features. However, a review of cited sections of Tokunaga finds no suggestion of sense a relation between a reverse current and a reverse voltage of the pixels for deriving degradation state data for the pixels.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tokunaga, Cok and Lee et al (US 2003/0151569).

Claim 6 includes all the features of claims 5 and 1 and further distinguishing features. Lee et al. is apparently cited for showing the additional features recited in claim 6; however, Lee et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Tokunaga and Cok as noted above in the discussion of claim 1.

Accordingly, applicants essentially repeat the above arguments from claim 1 and respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable by virtue of its dependency, as well as the additional subject matter recited therein and not shown in the combination of references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian Myers

Registration No.: 46,947

For: Larry Liberchuk,

Registration No.: 40,352

Mail all correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352

US PHILIPS CORPORATION

P.O. Box 3001

Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001